

Appeared in *Lingua* 117(1), 289-316. (2007)

Clausal architecture in Early Old French^{*}

Marie Labelle, Université du Québec à Montréal

(labelle.marie@uqam.ca)

In this paper we study the clausal architecture of Old French as it can be assessed from texts dating from the first half of the 12th century, a period labeled here for convenience *Early Old French*, and we compare it to what is known of 13th c. Old French. We show that the embedded clauses in our data are very different from 13th c. Old French. Both main and embedded clauses are verb second (V2) in some sense, but this state of the language cannot be qualified as a *symmetrical* V2 language. We propose to derive main clauses with a layered CP and embedded clauses with IP, and we spell out more precisely the clausal architecture we propose for both main and embedded clauses.

The next two sections present background information on the controversy regarding the V2 status of Early Old French, and the relevant aspects of 13th c. Old French. In section 3, it is shown that in EOF all types of embedded clauses have V2 constructions. While this suggests that Early Old French is a symmetrical V2 language, well-known facts concerning the position of subject and object pronouns lead us to maintain that main V2 clauses are derived within CP in

^{*} This research was made possible by grant #410-2001-0456 of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada awarded to Paul Hirschbühler. We thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments on previous versions of this paper.

EOF, just as in 13th c. OF. We then pursue our study of Early Old French clausal architecture by proposing a layered CP analysis of V2 in main clauses. Section 5 focuses on embedded clauses and shows that constructions of type XP-V, where the XP is distinct from a subject are not due to what is known as Stylistic Fronting. In section 6, we propose an account for V1 and V2 embedded clauses, then we discuss possible clausal architectures which may account for the V3 embedded clauses.

1 V2 in Old French

There are two main types of verb-second—V2—languages. So-called *asymmetrical* V2 languages, like German, Dutch and Swedish are V2 in main clauses but not in embedded clauses (except in the case of main clauses embedded under a bridge verb). Asymmetrical V2 languages are generally analyzed as having the verb under C and some XP in Spec,CP in main clauses (den Besten, 1989). In symmetrical V2 languages, main and embedded clauses are V2; this is the case in Yiddish (Diesing, 1990; Santorini, 1995). Icelandic was also claimed to be a symmetrical V2 language (Rögnvaldsson and Thráinsson 1990; Sigurðsson 1990), but Maling (1980/1990) has shown that embedded V2 clauses in that language result from an operation of Stylistic Fronting, to be discussed below. Symmetrical V2 languages are often analyzed as having the verb under I and some XP in Spec,IP in main and in embedded clauses, Spec,IP being an A-bar position. However Vikner (1995) and Schwartz and Vikner (1996) provide evidence that symmetrical V2 languages involve the CP layer as well.

While it is generally acknowledged that Old French was a V2 language, there is no consensus in the literature regarding the V2 structure of the language. The most commonly held view is that it was an asymmetrical V2 language (Adams, 1987; Roberts 1993; Vance, 1997), but Lemieux

and Dupuis (1995) and Sitaridou (2004) argue that it was a symmetrical V2 language. Kaiser (2000) has even argued that Old French was not V2 at all. The reason why authors differ in their assessment is that Old French has characteristics distinct from those of a typical Germanic V2 language. This justifies studying in detail the type of V2 exemplified in Old French and in other medieval Romance languages. Moreover, it is possible that the V2 character of Old French has changed over the years. Côté (1995) argues that Old French was V2 within IP during the 12th c., but V2 within CP during the 13th c. Vance (1997:31) analyzes 13th c. Old French as V2 within CP and alludes to the possibility that Early Old French was a symmetrical V2 language.

Most studies of Old French have used texts of the 13th c., as this is when the first literary prose texts are available. In this paper, we examine the clause structure of early 12th c. Old French, concentrating on the seven texts dated between 1100 and 1150 accessible online on the TFA database of the ARTFL project (<http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/efts/ARTFL>). The beginning of the 12th c. was chosen because we lack information on the type of V2 displayed by the oldest period for which we have sufficient evidence. There are not enough texts available before that date. The interest of restricting the study to a limited period (here 50 years) of the language is that there is a better chance of having a relatively coherent grammar, not mixing facts from different stages. On purpose, a 50-year gap was left between the texts studied here and the 13th c. That allows us to identify possible changes between this *Early Old French*, and the better studied 13th c Old French. The disadvantage of concentrating on this period of time is that the available texts are in verse, and we might expect freer word order, with probably more scrambling to accommodate the rhyme, but this is all we have available at this point. For comparison purposes, we have also

looked at an older text, Alexis, dated 1040; occasionally, some examples will be cited from that text.

2 13th c. Old French prose

Before turning to the Early Old French (hereafter EOF) data, it will be useful to summarize briefly relevant aspects of Vance's analysis of Old French based on 13th c. prose (Vance 1997). This will allow us to contrast our data to hers, and to pinpoint the differences between early 12th c. verse and 13th c. prose.

The basic clausal architecture adopted by Vance is as in (1), where, conforming to recent usage and to avoid ambiguity, we have used the label vP instead of VP for the projection dominating the subject's base position. The finite verb raises at least up to Agr⁰.

- (1) [CP [AgrP [TP [vP]]]]

In **main V2 clauses**, some topic constituent occupies Spec,CP, and the finite verb occupies C⁰. This is the standard analysis for V2, and it is schematized in (2).

- (2) [CP XP_{TOP} [C' V_{fin} [AgrP [TP [vP]]]]]

In inverted main clauses nominal subjects follow adverbs of the class *pas*, *puis*, *or*, considered adjoined to TP, rather than precede them, as would be expected if nominal subjects occupied Spec,AgrP. It is argued that topics and wh-phrases pass through Spec,AgrP, an A-bar position, on their way to Spec,CP. Spec,AgrP is occupied by a trace, and nominal subjects remain in a lower

position (which can be Spec,TP or Spec,vP; subjects may also occupy the clause-final position, where they are analysed as being right-adjoined to AgrP¹).

- (3) [CP *einsi*_i *ne le commande*_v [AgrP *t_i* [TP *pas* [***nostre ordre*** *t_v t_i*]]]] (*Q 120,6*)

thus neg it commands not our order

‘our order does not command it in this way’ (Vance 1997:68, ex. 49)

Pronominal subjects always precede adverbs of the *pas* class. They are always immediately to the right of the element occupying C⁰ if there is one, i.e. the verb in inverted V2 main clauses and the complementizer in embedded clauses. It is argued that they are clitics on C⁰ whenever C⁰ is projected. Because they don’t occupy Spec,AgrP, this allows topic phrases to pass through Spec,AgrP on their way to Spec,CP. The analysis is schematized in (5).

- (4) *car vilainie ne feroit il pas au vaslet* (*Q 89,10*)

for evil neg would-do he not to-the young-man

‘for he would not do evil to the young man (Vance 1997: 68, ex. 48a)

- (5) [CP XP_{TOP} [C’ V_{fin}+Sp [AgrP *t_{TOP}* [TP *pas* [TP [vP]]]]]

SVO main clauses are claimed to be AgrP’s, with the subject—nominal or pronominal—in Spec,AgrP.

Embedded clauses are SVO in the unmarked case. The verb remains in Agr⁰ and is preceded by a subject. True embedded V2 clauses are found only in conjunctive clauses. These V2

¹ For a recent analysis of post-verbal subjects in Romance, see Belletti (2004).

clauses are analyzed as having the structure of main clauses, with CP recursion. This is the only type of embedded clause where postverbal pronominal subjects are found.

- (6) et dit [_{CP} que [_{CP} bien [_{C'} soient+il [_{AgrP} ... venu]]]] (*Q4, 24*)

and says that well may-be they come

‘and says that they are welcome’ (Vance 1997: 144, ex. 18)

A second type of embedded clause which is superficially V2 is found in subject relative clauses, where it is proposed that *qui* moves from Spec,vP through Spec,TP to its final position within CP, skipping Spec,AgrP, which is therefore available for a topicalized non-subject phrase. A similar construction in Icelandic is labelled Stylistic Fronting.

- (7) devant que cil sera venuz [_{CP} qui [_{AgrP} **ceste aventure** [_{Agr'} doit] [_{TP} escheoir]]] (*Q4, 18*)

before that he will-be come who this adventure must finish

‘before the coming of the one who must bring this adventure to a close’ (Vance 1997:136, ex. 3)

Also in embedded clauses, the verb can be found in third position only when the first element is a pronominal subject. This is straightforwardly accounted for by assuming that pronominal subjects are clitics on C⁰, and that a topic occupies Spec,AgrP.

- (8) [_{CP} que+je [_{AgrP} **devant mon frere** [_{Agr'} viegne [...]]] (*Q 260,25*)

that I before my brother might-come

‘that I might come before my brother’ (Vance 1997:137, ex. 8)

Finally, referential null subjects are licensed only where postverbal pronominal subjects are licensed, that is, in inverted V2 contexts (Dupuis, 1988; Hirschbühler, 1990; Vance, 1988). They

are not found in embedded clauses, except in conjunctive V2 clauses. Rare exceptions to these generalizations are explained as either archaic or innovative (Vance 1997:226-229).

3 Structural differences between main and embedded clauses

In this section, we initiate our study of Early Old French by discussing the difference between main and embedded clauses. If EOF was a symmetrical V2 language, any constituent should be able to precede the verb both in main and in embedded clauses. This contrasts with later Old French, where the preverbal position is filled by a subject, and where embedded V2 (with a non subject preceding the verb) is found only in a limited number of embedded clauses, namely conjunctive CP recursion clauses and subject relative clauses. We show that in EOF, any constituent can occupy the first position of the clause to the left of the verb in all types of embedded clauses, conjunctive and nonconjunctive. In short, any clause can be superficially V2, using this label pretheoretically for the time being to refer to clauses where the verb may be preceded by a constituent distinct from a subject.

In all types of embedded clauses, non-subject phrases appear to the left of the finite verb. We give a sufficient number of examples to show that the construction is not exceptional. We illustrate V2 clauses with conjunctive clauses (9), subject relatives (10), object relatives (11), adverbial clauses (12), and indirect questions (13). The relevant verbs are in italics (here and henceforth). To eliminate the possibility of a V-final base in the embedded clause, we have provided as much as possible examples where the verb is not final.

(9) Conjunctive clauses

- a. Tedbald i ert si ivre [que **plus** *n' i poet estre*], (ChGuill p. 4 v. 32)

Tedbald loc is so drunk that more neg can be

‘T. is so drunk that he couldn’t be any more’

- b. En la cité vint la nouvele,/ sachiez [qu' **a ceus dedenz** fu bele]. (Thèbes1, p. 12)

In the city came the news, know that to those inside was good

‘The news came to the city, (you should) know that it was good news to those inside’

- c. Mes ice m' est mout grant confort /[que **par bon chevalier** sui mort]; (Thèbes1, p. 183)

but this me-is much great comfort / that by good knight am dead

‘but this is great comfort to me that I am killed by a good knight’

- d. Quand li remembre del glorieus del ciel, /[Que **d' ome ocire** est trop mortex pechié]. (CoLouis2, p. 25)

when him-reminds from the glorious of the heaven / that of man kill is much mortal sin

‘when the Glorious in Heaven reminds him that to kill a man is a mortal sin’

- e. oï [que **par la tour livrer** / pueent son enfant delivrer]. (Thèbes2, p. 42)

hears that by the tower surrender / can-3pl her son deliver

‘(she) hears that by surrendering the tower they can deliver her son’

(10) Subject relative clauses introduced by complementizer *qui*

- a. Nel fist mais home [qui **de mere** fust né] (ChGuill, p. 79)

neg-it-made ever man who from mother be born

‘no man who was born from a woman ever did that’

- b. dejuste li, Guntier Geudon, /[qui **esquier** fud al barun]; (Gormont p. 36 v. 548-549)

next to him, Guntier Geudon, who squire was to-the baron

- c. Veez venir noz annemis / [qui **Thideüs** nos ont ocis]: (Thèbes2 p. 15)

see-2pl come our enemies / who Thideus us-have killed

‘Look at our enemies coming, who have killed our Thideus’

Antecedent-less subject relatives with *wh*-*qui*:

- d. [Qui **son corage** *li vorroit acointier*,] Bien nos porroit encui avoir mestier. (CoLouis1 p.219)

who his courage him-would-want to make known, well us-could now need

‘who would want to make his courage known to him could well need us now’

- e. [Qui **par ici** *voudra passer*] / *morir l' estuet ou deviner.* » (Thèbes1, p. 91)

who by here will-want to-pass / die have-to or guess

‘who will want to pass here will have to guess or die’

- f. [Qui **en ce jor** *morra en la bataille*], /En paradis sera son herbergement, ; (CoLouis1, p. 65)

who in this day will-die in the battle, / in paradise will-be his lodging

(11) Object relative clauses with antecedent

- a. et leur seingnor regretent fort [/qu’ **iluecques** *voient* gesir mort]. (Thèbes 1, p. 188)

and their sire regret much [that there see lie dead]

‘and they regret much their sire that they see lying dead over there’

- b. Oiés l’ outrage [qu’ **aveuc lui** *ont* mené]. (MoniageG1, p. 39, 912)

hear the affront that with him have made

‘Hear the affronts that they inflicted upon him’

- c. Sur li corent Sarazin e Escler, Tels quinze reis [qui **ben** *vus sai* nomer]; (ChGuill*, p.84, 2056-2057) (*qui* here is an object)

To him run Sarazins and Esclers, those fifteen kings that well you-know name

‘towards him run Sarazins and Esclers, those fifteen kings that I can well name to you’

- d. Ulte la mer vol en le val / A l' altre enfern [u **tant** *ad mal*] (Brandan, 1361-2) *over the sea fly in the valley / to the other inferno where so-many are tortures*

‘over the sea I fly in the valley to the other inferno where there are so many tortures’

- e. Traient lur nef amunt le gort La [u **devant** *ourent* lur port]. (Brandan, 855-6)

Draw their boat up the river where before had their harbor

‘They draw their boat up the river to where (they) had previously found a harbor’

- f. Totes ses armes out guerpi li frans / Fors sul s' espee [dunt **d' ascer** *fu li brant*],

(ChGuil p. 34, 731-2)

all his arms had abandoned the Frank / except only his sword of-which of steel was the blade

‘the Frank had abandoned all his arms, except for his sword whose blade was of steel’

- g. N' i ad icelui ne porte sanglante espee / [Dunt **al champ** *unt feru granz colees*]; (ChGuil p. 24, v. 491-2)

neg-there has the-one neg carry bloody sword / with-which in the field have struck great blows

‘there is no one who doesn’t have a bloody sword, with which he struck great blows in the field’

Without antecedent:

- h. Ne seit [pur quei **al cors** *me puisse* entrer] / Que plein pé fuie de bataille champel;

(Ch.Guill. p. 40-41, v. 902-903)

neg be for what in-the body me can enter / that full foot flee from battle field

‘Let it not be (anything) that could bring into my body (the thought) that I flee one foot breadth from the battle ground’

(12) Adverbial clauses

- a. [Cum **a terre** ariverent], / Les tempestes aviverent; (Brandan, 969-70)

As-soon-as to land arrived,/ the tempests hightened

- b. Ja nel verrun vencu / [Tant cum **le cheval** laissun vif suz lui], /

never neg-him will-see-Ipl defeat / as long as the horse let-Ipl alive under him / Ja

*ne veintrum le noble vassal [Quant **desuz lui** leissun vif sun cheval]. (Ch.Guill. p. 35, v. 763-766)*

never neg defeat-fut-Ip the noble vassal [when/if under him let-Ip live his horse]

‘we will never defeat him as long as we let live his horse under him, we will not defeat him if we let live his horse under him’

- c. Li rois, [pour ce que **tant l' a chier**], / adoubé l' a a chevalier ; (Thèbes1 p. 5)

the king, because so-much him-has dear / dubbed him-has to knight

‘the king, because he has him so dear, dubbed him knight’

- d. [puis que **de mort** ot la nouvele], / a paines puet tenir en sele.(Thèbes1 p. 187)

since that of death heard the news,/ barely can remain on saddle

‘since he has heard the news of the death, he can barely remain on his saddle.’

- e. ... [Ainz qu' **a l' isle** vengent Albeu] / U estreient al Naël Deu. (Brandan 617-8)

before to the island came Albe /where were at Christmas Day

‘...before they came to Albe Island where they were at Christmas Day’

- f. [Se **la me** rens em pes sanz guerre],/ je te dourrai iceste terre. (Thebes1, p. 94)

if there me-arrive in peace without war,/ I you will-give this land

‘if I arrive there in peace without war, I will give you this land’

- g. [Se **de tels homes** *éussiens* a plenté], /Rice seriens anchois un mois passé; (MoniageG1 p. 17, 422-423)

If of such men had-I plenty / rich would-be before a month passed

‘If we had plenty of such men, we would be rich within a month’

(13) Indirect questions

- a. « Amis, dit ele, dites moi, /je vous conjur par vostre loi,

friend, said she, tell me / I you beg by your law

[se **as jeus fustes** l’ autre jor ou l’ en ocist le mien seignor] (Thebes1, p. 14)

if to-the games were the other day when one killed the my sire

‘Friend, said she, tell me, I beg you by your law, if you were to the games the other day when was killed my sire.’

- b. Frere Brandan, or te ai dit / [Cument **ici ai** mun delit]. (Brandan, 1592-93)

Brother Brandan, now (I) you have-Is said [how here have-Is my pleasure]

‘Brother Brandan, I have now told you how much pleasure I have here’

- c. Dites m' en voir et [de quel terre vos venez], et [pour quoi **tel deul demenez**]. (Thèbes2, p. 122)

tell me+gen truth and of which land you come and why such mourning express

‘tell me the truth and of which land you are coming, and why you express such mourning’

- d. ne sai [s' **onques l' oïstes** dire]. (Thèbes1 p. 74)

not know if ever it-hear say

‘I don’t know if you ever heard it said’

- e. Freres, savez [Pur quei **poür** oït avez]? (Brandan, 467-8)
Brothers, know why fear have had
 ‘Brothers, do you know why you had fear?’
- f. tout sagement lor demanda [qui **ces nouveles** aporta]. (Thèbes2 p.124)
very quietly them-asked who these news brought
 ‘very quietly (he) asked them who brought these news’
- g. Ne sai, fet il, [quel gent menue **nostre proie** ont aperceüe]. (Thèbes2, p. 34)
not know, says he, what people small our prey have seen
 ‘I don’t know, says he, what small people have seen our prey’

Of the above types of examples, Vance finds, in 13th c. prose, only clauses introduced by the complementizer *que*, like (9), and subject relatives, like (10). In (10a-c) *qui* is a complementizer bearing subject features (it can have a [–human] antecedent); in the antecedentless relatives (10d-f) it is a wh word bearing a [+human] feature (it could have a function other than that of subject). Vance doesn’t distinguish between subject relatives introduced by a complementizer, and those introduced by a wh-word, but the analysis she develops accounts for both if the operator, covert in (10a-c), overt in (10d-f), moves from the base position of the subject to Spec,CP, skipping Spec,AgrP. The same analysis accounts for subject indirect questions like (13f-g). Vance also mentions a few examples with conditional *se* ‘if’ and *quant* in its non-temporal meaning, which she considers, correctly given the present data, to be residual word orders from an earlier system (p. 148). What she explicitly doesn’t find is [+wh] complementizers. Examples (11c-h), (12a-b), and (13a-e), therefore, are crucial in showing that in EOF embedded V2 is available in all types of embedded clauses, even those introduced by a wh element distinct from a subject.

Generalized embedded V2 is typical of symmetrical V2 languages, and one may think that a V2-within-IP framework would account for V2 main clauses during the same period. Both in main and in embedded clauses Spec,IP would be an A' position where the clause-initial constituent would appear. This is what is proposed by Côté (1995), Lemieux and Dupuis (1995), and more recently by Sitaridou (2004). In that hypothesis, inverted subjects would occupy Spec,vP, or possibly Spec,TP in a layered IP of type (1) (or be right-adjoined to IP). The problem with that hypothesis is that there are asymmetries between main and embedded clauses that show that main clauses have a V2-within-CP structure. Thus, while embedded clauses and main clauses have V2 constructions, they are not generated by the same mechanism, and EOF is not a symmetrical V2 language. We review the relevant arguments in the next section, where we also discuss the clausal architecture of main clauses, before coming back, in section 5, to embedded clauses.

4 The clausal architecture of main clauses

In this section we present arguments leading to the conclusion that main clauses are derived within CP, and then we describe the clausal architecture we adopt for main clauses.

The main argument for generating V2 within CP in main clauses is well known and is provided by the position of pronominal subjects. We follow Vance (1988, 1997) and Roberts (1993) in claiming that pronominal subjects are never lower than Spec,IP in Old French, as their arguments carry over by and large to Early Old French. Thus, in embedded clauses pronominal subjects immediately follow the complementizer even in V3 constructions where they are separated from the verb by a constituent (14) (some counterexamples will be mentioned in (20)). This word order suggests that they are at least as high as Spec,IP.

- (14) a. [Quant **il** Willame *nus amenat* ici]; (ChGuill, 1788)
 ... *when he William us-brought here.*
 ‘when he brought William to us’
- b. [Se **je** par force *puis prendre* cest terrier] (CoLouis1, 541)
 if I by force can take this territory
 ‘If I can take this territory by force’
- c. [u **il** ainceis *l’ot mort rué*]. (Gormond, 528)
 where he previously him-had dead thrown
 ‘where he had thrown him dead previously’

In inverted main clauses, pronominal subjects are always immediately next to the finite verb and to the left of adverbs like *pas*, *unques*, which immediately follow the finite verb in non-inverted clauses. This word order is expected if the verb in main clauses is under C^0 , with the subject at least as high as Spec,IP.

- (15) a. A mout maint home *a* **il** *tolu* la vie, (MoniageG1, p.29)
 Of many men has he taken the life
 ‘he has taken the life of many men’
- b. Mais a la bataille n' *ose* **il** pas venir. (ChGuill, 79)
 but to the fight neg-dare he not come
 ‘but he doesn’t dare come to the battle’
- c. *Fustes* **vus** unques baptizé ne levé? (ChGuill, 3484)
 Were you ever baptized nor raised
 ‘were you ever baptized?’

Pronominal subjects are never postverbal in embedded clauses except in clauses introduced by *que*, which may be analyzed as embedded main clauses (i.e. embedded clauses having the structure of V2 main clauses). The fact that the order V-Subject Pronoun is restricted to main clauses is straightforwardly accounted for if this word order obtains when the verb is in the complementizer system to the left of the pronoun in Spec,IP. In our data, we found only the four examples below of postverbal pronominal subjects in conjunctive embedded clauses.²

- (16) a. Au fonz l' en mainne le fer dont fu chargié, / [Que puis par home ne fu **il** hors sachié]
To the bottom him-carry the iron of which (he) was loaded / that hence by man neg
was he out brought
 'The metal of his arms drags him to the bottom (of the river), so that he was never seen again' (CoLouis2 p.403, v. 2588) (CoLouis1, v. 2613)
- b. Tres bien li dites, voiant ses compaignons, / [Que ainz le vespre en sera **il** hontos] / N'i
 vorroit estre por l'anor de Mascons (CoLouis2 p.263, v. 1775)

² The first three examples are from the same text, *Le couronnement de Louis* dated by Langlois circa 1130 (CoLouis1), but simply as XIIth c. in the TFA bibliography (CoLouis2). All three examples are mentioned without the *il* in other variants. For example, the verse in (16b) reads, in other variants « Qu'ainz l'avesprer en sera si hontos... » 'he will be *so* ashamed at the end of the day' (that he would give anything to be elsewhere) (CoLouis1, v. 1794; CoLouis2, p. 262-63). Apart from this text, only one example of a postverbal pronominal subject was found, (16d), from a text dated 1150. The scarcity of this construction and the absence of the postverbal *il* in other versions leads us to speculate that the construction might have emerged during the 12th c.

*Very well him tell, seeing his comrades,/ that at the end of the day of it will-be he
ashamed /(he) neg there-want to be for the gold of Mascons.*

‘Very well, tell him in front of this men, that at the end of the day he will be ashamed,
he will not want to be there for (all) the gold of Mascons.’

- c. Si me diroiz Looÿs le filz Challe / [Qu' a mout grant tort *velt il* gaster ma marche],... ;
(CoLouis1, p. 363, 2345)

If me-said Louis the son-of Charles / that with much great injustice wants-he to-
devastate my country

‘If Louis the son of Charles told me that he wanted to devastats my country with great
injustice’

- d. Pollinics de ce n’ a cure, ainçois affiche bien et jure [que a soi ne a son cheval *ne
prendra il* iluec estal]. (Thebes 1, p. 24, v. 981)

*Pollinices of this not mind, and then declares well and swears [that to him nor to his
horse neg-will-take he there lodging.*

‘Pollinices doesn’t care, and declares and swears that he will provide lodging neither to
him nor to his horse.’

We may add to these arguments the fact that expletives have the same distribution as other
pronominal subjects, i.e. next to the complementizer in embedded clauses (17a) and immediately
next to the verb in inverted main clauses (17b-c). Expletives are not merged within vP, being
non-argumental, and we take this as a further argument in favor of the assumption that postverbal
subject pronouns are higher than Spec,vP.

- (17) a. [Se *il i fussent* chertes cinquante et troi], (MoniageG1 p.27)

if expl loc be certainly fifty and three

‘if there were certainly fifty-three’

- b. *A il François qui por mon cors le face?* (CoLouis1, 2410)

has expl Frenchmen who for my person it-do?

Are there any Frenchmen who would do it for me?

- c. *Dont est il droiz et reson que m’ asailles* (CoLouis2 p.125, v.892)

whence is it right and reasonable that me assail

‘whence it is right and reasonable that (you) assail me’

Vance (1997: 48-49) adopts Roberts’ idea that pronominal subjects are cliticized to C⁰ (Roberts, 1993: 98, 139). As mentioned in section 2, this explains the adjacency relation between the pronoun and the element occupying C⁰ as well as the fact that, in her data, it is only when there is a pronominal subject that some other constituent can intervene between the subject and the verb, giving rise to a V3 construction in embedded clauses. In that construction, pronominal subjects being cliticized to C⁰, a topicalized constituent would occupy Spec,AgrP.

- (18) [_{CP} que+je [_{AgrP} devant mon frere [_{Agr’} viegne [...]]] (Q 260,25)

that I before my brother might-come

‘that I might come before my brother’ (Vance 1997:137, ex. 8)

For Early Old French, we will not adopt the cliticization to C⁰ analysis and will simply assume that pronominal subjects occupy Spec,IP. The reason for rejecting cliticization to C⁰ is that, as we will see in detail in section 6, embedded V3 constructions of the type illustrated in (18) are not limited to cases with a pronominal subject. Also, while there is considerable orthographic evidence for cliticization in the case of object clitic pronouns, there is, to our knowledge, no such

evidence in the case of pronominal subjects. There is no example of type (19) that would show that the subject pronoun is cliticized to C. While lack of evidence is not proof of absence, it is nevertheless suggestive³.

(19) *Ne fust cist enfes [que+**j** port] (variant of Thebes1 p.71)

were it not of this baby that I bear

‘If it weren’t for the baby that I bear’

Third, the EOF data contains four cases where pronominal subjects are separated from C⁰, two like (20a) and two like (20b). The word order *que* - *XP* - *S_p* attested in these examples should not be a possibility if pronominal subjects were cliticized to C⁰. Example (20a) is straightforwardly accounted for by the assumption that pronominal subjects occupy Spec,IP and that the embedded clause that intervenes between the complementizer and the pronoun is a parenthetical; the word order in (20b) will be discussed in section 6.⁴

³ Vance assumes that subject pronouns are syntactic clitics on C and phonological clitics to the right.

⁴ The two other examples are the following:

(i) [que, se tu vels, **il** t’avra grant mestier] (CoLouis p. 35)

‘that, if you want, it will-be very necessary...’

(ii) Mult fames grant folie, /[ke cest diable **nus** laissum ci oscire] (ChGuill p. 130)

‘we did a fool thing that this devil we let here kill’

One reviewer observes that (20a) and (i) look as if the clause starts over again after the interruption, and adds that “by early Middle French there would be a tendency to repeat the *que*

- (20) a. Que s' il vosist **il** l' eüst mis a pié (CoLouis2 p.153, v.1095)
that if he had wanted, he him-would-have put to foot
 ' that, if he had wanted, he would have knocked him off his mount'
- b. Tu ne veiz rien de ma peine [Que enz enfern **jo** demaine]; (Brandan, 1301-2)
you neg see nothing of my pain [that in hell I undergo]
 'You see nothing of the suffering that I undergo in hell'

Given the preceding facts, we will assume that pronominal subjects occupy Spec,IP both in main and in embedded clauses. This feature of EOF is similar to Old Germanic, for which Fuss (2003) proposes that pronominal subjects are pure formal feature bundles [D, Nom, Phi] attracted by T's [+Nom] features when T is introduced into the derivation (assuming that T is the highest head within IP). In inverted main clauses, the verb is within the complementizer system, to the left of Spec,IP. The difference between main and embedded clauses is exemplified very clearly in the wh-clauses in (21). In the root clause, the verb precedes the pronominal subject (21a). In the embedded clause, the verb follows the pronominal subject (21b).

- (21) a. “ Seignurs, “ dist il, “ [CP u devez [IP **vus** aler]]]? (ChGuill, p.117, v. 2963)
Sire, said he, where must you go?
- b. A un destreit [CP u [IP **il** deveient passer]] (ChGuill, p.117, v. 2961)
To a narrow-pass where they had-to pass.

before the second *il*". In fact, the cliticisation hypothesis leads us to expect repetition of the complementizer to provide support for the clitic. In (20b) and (ii), the pronoun might be tonic.

Let us now turn to the position of object clitic pronouns, which confirms the asymmetry between main clauses and embedded clauses and leads us to adopt a layered CP account for V2 in main clauses. Here again, the basic facts are well known, but their analysis has always been a problem within a simple CP model. Object clitic pronouns are found in postverbal position *only in V1 main clauses*. This is the Tobler-Mussafia effect, found in all types of clauses: declaratives, questions, imperatives. Tobler (1875) and Mussafia (1886) noted that object pronominal clitics were postverbal only when being preverbal would place them in clause initial position. Examples are given in (22) (object clitics in bold italics).

- (22) a. *Vait+s'en* Brendan vers le grant mer (Brendan, 157)

go refl-loc Brendan towards the big sea

‘Brendan goes away towards the sea’

- b. Fiz a putein, *dis+me* tu dunc verité? (ChGuill p.128)

Son of a bitch, tell-me you then truth

‘s.o.b. are you telling me the truth, then’

- c. Dist as freres : ‘*Entrez+en* enz!’ (Brendan, 185)

Said to the brothers : ‘Come loc in’

‘(He) said to the brothers : Come in!’

Object clitics are preverbal in V2 main clauses—where they intervene linearly between the clause-initial constituent and the verb to which they are cliticized (again in all types of clauses: declaratives, questions, imperatives). As illustrated in (22b) and (23a-b), whether they follow or precede the verb, object clitics are always to the left of subject pronouns. We interpret this as showing that they are within the CP system.

- (23) a. Et sa seror *li+fist* il esposer. (CoLouis1, 2692)

and his sister him-made he marry

‘and he had him marry his sister’

- b. u *en+vas* tu ? (Brandan, 1322)

where loc go you

‘Where are you going ?’

- c. Ber saint Denis, or *m’an+aidiez* ! (Gormont, 374)

Baron Saint Denis, thus me-loc help

‘Baron Saint Denis, help me !’

In embedded clauses, object clitics are always preverbal, even when that position places them in IP initial position. This is further evidence for an asymmetry between main and embedded clauses: only object clitics within the CP system are found postverbally.

- (24) a. Vivien, sire, sez [que *te+feruns*]? (ChGuill, 615)

Vivien, sire, know what you-will-do

‘Vivien, sire, (do you) know what (we) will do to you ?’

- b. Trenchad le braz [que *li+sist* en l’ enarme], (ChGuill, 443)

Cut the arm that him-was in the shield

‘(He_i) cut off the_j arm with which (he) was holding the shield’

There are two general approaches to the Tobler-Mussafia effect: either the verb moves over the clitics to their left (Benincà, 1991, 1995 ; Cardinaletti & Roberts, 2002 ; Martins, 2000 [1995] ; Rivero, 1997, and many others) or the clitics are realized to the right of the verb for prosodic reasons (Fontana, 1996; Halpern, 1992). Labelle & Hirschbühler (2001) reject a

prosodic account, because OF object clitics were neither lexically specified as enclitic nor unable to bear clause-initial stress. Thus, object clitics were proclitic on the verb in the normal O_{cl}-V word order, as attested by the elision of the vowel in (25), and they could also be proclitic on a following word in the V-O_{cl} word order, particularly in the oldest texts (26) (examples (26b,c) are from Alexis, dated 1040).

(25) je l' orrai (thebes1, p.11)

I it will-hear.

‘I will listen to it’

(26) a. dunez m'un feu. (Roland. 866)

give me=a fief

b. Cil vait, sil qiert, fait l'el mostier venir.(Alexis XXXVII)

This (man) go, si him look-for, make him=in-the monastery come

‘He goes, looks for him, has him come to the monastery’

c. Li apostolies et li emperedour/ viennent devant, getent s'ad oreisons. (Alexis, LXXII)

The pope and the emperor/come to the front, throw themselves=into prayers

The above examples show that object pronouns were not intrinsincally enclitics. Moreover, they were able to appear first in their intonational domain, as observed by de Kok (1985), with example (27a) where the clitic is preverbal after a parenthetical clause. (27b-c) are similar examples from the texts we studied. Object clitics could also form the nucleus of the clause initial syllable. This was the case when the clause initial constituent was a monosyllabic element whose vowel was elided in front of a vocalic clitic (28a-b), or when the pronoun encliticized to and fused with the clause initial particle (28c) (*nes* = *n(e)+(l)es*). Stress falling on syllable nuclei, in

(28), the stress would fall on the clitic. This is unexpected if object clitics are analyzed as being unable to bear clause initial stress. We would expect elision or encliticization to be blocked in these contexts in order to prevent the stress falling on the clitics.

(27) a. Jo, qui voldreie parler a tei, **le** receverái. (QLR, in Kok 1985: 173)

‘I, who would like to talk to you, will receive him’

b. et je , s' il vous i plect entendre, **vous en** sai bien la cause rendre. (thebes2, p.89)

and I, if expl. you loc pleases hear, you gen know well the reason give

‘and I, if it pleases you to hear it, can very well tell you the reason’

c. Tout ainsi, fet il, **le** férons (Thebes 1, p. 107)

Just so, says he, it will-do

‘We will do it just so, says he’

(28) a. N’ **i** ad castel, ki devant lui remaigne; (Roland, 4)

neg there have castle that before him stay

‘No castle could resist him’

b. S’ **en** volt ostages, e vos l’ en enveiez, (Roland, 40)⁵

⁵ One reviewer asks whether (28b) should ‘count’ even though the preverbal clitic is in an embedded clause, clitics being always preverbal in embedded clauses. If the explanation for the postverbal position of clitics is prosodic, and not syntactic, the example counts. There is no prosodic reason for the clitic to suddenly be able to bear clause-initial stress if it happens that the first syllable is that of an embedded clauses. If one takes into account the fact that the clitic is in

if (he) GEN want hostages, and you him GEN send...

‘if he wants hostages, and (if) you send some to him...’

- c. **Nes** poet guarder (Roland, 9)

neg+them can keep

‘he can’t keep them’

We thus reject a prosodic account of the V-O_{cl} word order and adopt the general approach developed by Labelle and Hirschbühler (2005), which we will modify slightly to make it compatible with ideas developed by Pesetsky and Torrego (2004). Labelle and Hirschbühler assume a CP system with two functional projections, a discourse-related head labeled “Z” and Rizzi (1997)’s Fin(ite) head, the interface of the C system carrying a [+/-T] feature. For EOF main clauses, they propose that Z has a discourse-related feature [F] (an interpretable feature [*i*F]), and that this feature must be checked (valued) by a constituent marked with a corresponding feature. They also propose that Z selects a Fin head with a V feature, perhaps more appropriately an uninterpretable T feature (Pesetsky & Torrego, 2004; this feature is [+Agr] in Roberts, 1993, and in Arteaga & Herschensohn, to appear). V2 clauses would result from some XP bearing an uninterpretable but valued F feature [*u*F val] merging in SpecZP and a verb bearing an interpretable Tense feature, V[*i*T val], moving to Fin.

(29) [ZP XP[*u*F val] Z[*i*F] [FinP V[*i*T val]_i Fin[*u*T] [IP *il* ...*t_i*...]]]

an embedded clause in (28b), we fall back on a syntactic account, or, perhaps worse, on a mixture of a prosodic account for main clauses and a syntactic account for embedded clauses.

Crucially, this holds for all illocutionary types : declaratives, questions and imperatives. In other words, if distinct +WH, +IMPERATIVE, etc. features are present for interpretative reasons, they have no visible effect on the overt syntax of V in EOF.

As for object clitics, Labelle and Hirschbühler argue that they adjoin to the highest inflectional head hosting the verb, i.e. having a [T] feature. That would be Fin in main clauses and I in embedded clauses.

(30) Et [_{ZP} sa seror_k [_{FinP} [_{Fin} li [_{Fin} *fist*_i [_{IP} il t_i esposer t_k]]]]]. (CoLouis1, 2692) (=27a)

and his sister him-made he marry

‘and he had him marry his sister’

In V1 clauses, it is claimed that the [*u*F] feature is on the finite verb, which moves up to Z, whose [*i*F] feature it values. In moving to Z, the verb leaves the clitics behind within FinP, giving rise to the V-O_{cl} word order.

(31) [_{ZP} [_Z Vait_i [_{FinP} [_{Fin} s’en [_{Fin} t_i [_{IP} Brendan t_i vers le grant mer]]]]] (Brendan, 157) (=25a)

go refl-loc Brendan towards the big sea

‘Brendan goes away towards the sea’

This analysis accounts for V2 with a layered CP having only two projections, but it raises the question as to what exactly the “Z” head is. In Labelle and Hirschbühler, Z is a general discourse-related head subsuming Topic and Focus. At least three other possibilities are mentioned in the literature. In Vance (1997), as in most of the literature on V2, the clause-initial element is a Topic. Poletto (2003), assuming the layered CP structure in (32) from Benincà and Poletto (2002), proposes that V2 would take place in Declarative Force in RhaetoRomance and perhaps

Old French, and in Informational Focus in Old Italian (she assumes a standard type of V2, with the verb under the V2 head and some constituent in the specifier of that head.)

- (32) [Hang. Topic [Scene Sett.[DeclForce [Left disl. [List interpr [[FOCUS. CP] [Wh-opCP]]]
 | FRAME | | THEME | | FOCUS |

Let us look more closely at that analysis. It can be seen in (32) that CP comprises a number of frame elements (hanging topics and scene setting elements) dominating Declarative Force, which itself dominates some Thematic elements (left dislocated elements and list interpretation themes), and finally focus elements (informational focus and wh-operator focus). The crucial distinction between the Declarative Force and Informational Focus positions for V2 is that, when V2 is realized in Focus, it can be preceded by left dislocated elements, considered as types of Topics, which is not the case when DeclForce is the V2 projection. Turning back to EOF, the word order in (33), with a left dislocated element preceding a V2 clause, suggests that the clause initial XP is low in the layered CP, [Spec,Focus] being a likely candidate (example (33a) is from the first half of the 12th c.; (33b) is dated 1040).

- (33) a. **Icoste fole gent de France_i**,/ [mut par *unt* il_i fole esperance] (Gormond 78-80)
these mad people of France, very much have they unreasonable hope
 ‘these mad people of France, they have a very unreasonable hope’
- b. Sed a mei soule vels une feiz parlasse_s,/**Ta lasse medre_i** [si *la_i* reconfortasse_s].
If to me only at least one time speak / your poor mother si her-comfort
 ‘If you had spoken to me at least once/ you would have comforted your poor mother’. (Alexis XC, 449)

In support of the Spec,Foc position for the V2 head, notice that if the discourse-related head hosting the preverbal constituent in a V2 clause is a type of Focus, the uniform behavior of wh-operator constructions (questions) and the other clause types (declaratives and imperatives) with respect to V2 does not come as a surprise.

While this data suggests that ZP could be identified with Informational Focus, we will leave the question of the exact nature of ZP standing because determining the discourse function of the initial phrase of a V2 clause would require further study, particularly in view of the fact that Frey (2000 :166) shows, for German, that the elements in the Vorfeld (i.e. within CP) can carry distinct discursive features : a wh-focus feature in direct questions, a focus feature when the clause initial constituent is focalized, but also a discourse-linked ‘familiarity’-type Topic feature. Frey shows that ‘aboutness’-topics occur within IP in German. If the discourse structure of Early Old French is similar in the relevant respects to that of German, a general Z head bearing a discourse-linked type of feature might be better suited to the types of elements preceding the verb than a Focus head.

One interesting aspect of the layered approach to CP for medieval Romance languages proposed by Benincà and Poletto combined with Labelle and Hirschbühler’s analysis of V2, is that it allows for the occurrence of V3 main clauses. In the texts studied, V3 constructions are not exceptional. (34a-b), for example, appear to be a subject left dislocations, with a null subject within the clause. The indirect question (34d), on the other hand, doesn’t appear to be a left dislocation, the pronoun referring back to the clause initial constituent being accusative while the initial constituent is a PP. Here, we may have a hanging topic where *de* would be a shortcut for *au sujet de* ‘regarding’. Notice that the clause initial element precedes the WH interrogative *ou* in

that example. V3 main clauses merit a more detailed study, and we leave the matter for further research.

- (34) a. [**Ma longe atente** [**a grant duel** *est venude*]] (Alexis LXXXIX 443)

my long wait to great pain is come

‘my long wait has ended in great pain’

- b. [**Je** [**qu’** *en diroie*]]? (Thebes1, p.37)

I, what of-it say ?

‘Me, what should I say about it?’

- c. [**La bone enseine qu’il tint**, / [**de l’autre part** *en fit eissir*]] (Gormond 171-172)

the good spear that he held / on the other side gen-made come out

‘he made the good spear that he held come out on the other side (of his opponent)’

- d. Mais or nos dites, pour sainte karité,/ [**De cest avoir**_i, [**ou** l_i’ *avés conquesté*.]]

(MoniageG1, p.34, 797-798)

but thus us-tell, for saint charity, of these holdings, where it-have conquered

‘but tell us, by charity, these holdings, where you have conquered them’

The existence of V3 clauses led Kaiser to claim that OF was not V2 at all. But if “V2” is simply a convenient label for a construction where the verb moves to the complementizer system with some discourse-linked element of the clause appearing in a specifier position to its left, Old French has undeniable V2 characteristics despite the fact that the verb is not strictly speaking in second position of the clause in examples like (34). Poletto (2003) shows that V3+ sentences were particularly frequent in Old Italian due to the extensive use of frame setting elements in that

language. The difference between the various V2 languages seems to stem in part from the use of other positions in the left periphery of the clause.

To summarize, we have established that the asymmetry between main and embedded clauses holds for Early Old French verse just as it does for 13th c. Old French prose, and we have adopted a layered CP structure to account for V2 in main clauses. We have also established that the V2 head is low within the layered CP, because the V2 clause can be preceded by elements in the left periphery of the clause, in particular left dislocated elements. In the rest of this paper, we come back to embedded clauses, and to their analysis.

5 Against Stylistic Fronting in EOF

A number of authors have proposed to account for Old French embedded V2 examples as resulting from Stylistic Fronting rather than true embedded V2 (Cardinaletti & Roberts 2002; Mathieu 2005; Roberts 1993 :98; Vance 1997:193; Fischer and Alexiadou 2001 for Old Catalan). It is therefore important to clearly distinguish the two constructions. Stylistic Fronting is sometimes defined as “a rule which moves a category to a position in front of the finite verb in those sentences where the position in front of the verb (Spec,IP) is not occupied by an overt subject NP.”(Fischer and Alexiadou 2001). If one sees Stylistic Fronting simply as a means of filling a preverbal position not already filled by a subject, it is unclear under what criteria it can be distinguished from V2 (where the preverbal constituent is either a subject or some other element), and, indeed Stylistic Fronting has been used to describe a host of distinct constructions. In order to determine whether embedded clauses of type XV are V2 or result from Stylistic Fronting, some criteria must be used to distinguish the two constructions. The position adopted

here is that they differ by the following characteristics (based on Bailyn, 2004; Fisher and Alexiadou 2001; Holmberg, 2000; Jónsson 1991; Maling, 1980/1990).

- 1) Stylistic Fronting is an exceptional construction in a language where embedded clauses are normally SVO. As a result of Stylistic Fronting, Spec,IP is filled, i.e. the verb remains in second position of the clause.
- 2) Stylistic Fronting requires a subject gap. It occurs: a) in subject relative clauses; b) in embedded subject questions; c) in impersonal sentences where the subject remains within vP (Fischer and Alexiadou 2001 : 117); d) in stylistically marked constructions like extraposition where the subject is right-adjoined to the clause.
- 3) Stylistic Fronting involves mainly X^0 categories—negation, adverbs, predicative adjectives, untensed verbs— (Jónsson 1991; Maling 1990:76), although XP's are apparently not totally excluded (Holmberg 2000). Jónsson claims that only heads are affected and that Stylistic Fronting of bare nouns is always very marginal (1991 :13).
- 4) Stylistic Fronting is subject to an accessibility hierarchy: negation (& sentence adverbs) > adjective > verb & particle. This hierarchy appears to stem from the fact that Stylistic Fronting tends to affect the element closest to SpecIP.
- 5) Stylistic Fronting is clause-bound.

By contrast, embedded V2 is not subject to these constraints. It corresponds to the possibility for any constituent to freely occupy a position to the left of the verb (with possibly some interpretative effect linked to occupying the clause-initial position). If Spec,IP is an A-bar position freely available to any constituent, this will not be considered Stylistic Fronting. We will

ignore the fifth criterion, for which we have no relevant evidence, and concentrate on the first four.

Some authors take the position that V2 affects only XPs while Stylistic Fronting may or must affect heads (Jónsson 1991), and, in consequence, take the presence of a participle or an infinitive in front of the finite verb as a diagnostic for Stylistic Fronting (Mathieu 2005). For Early Old French, we see no reason to take that position, because participles and infinitives may occupy the first position in main V2 clauses, as shown below, and we know of no evidence that main clauses starting with a past participle or an infinitive should not be treated as fulfilling the requirements of V2.

- (35) a. **Alez** *en est* en un verger suz l' umbre. (Roland, 11)

gone loc-is in a orchard below the shade

‘he has gone to an orchard in the shade’

- b. **oïr** *pouez* qu' ele li dist. (Thèbes1, p. 81)

hear can-2p what she him tells

‘you can hear what she tells him’

Moreover, given the layered CP analysis of V2 main clauses adopted here, if one wants to maintain that nonfinite verbs can only move to head positions, the above sentences can be accounted for by assuming that the nonfinite verb occupies the head position of ZP rather than Spec,ZP. This analysis, illustrated below, is perfectly compatible with our account of V2 and it does not require postulating an unmotivated distinct account for these main clauses.

- (36) [ZP [Z' X_[uF val] Z_[iF] [FinP V_{[iT val]i} Fin_[uT] [IP il ...t_i...]]]]

Cardinaletti & Roberts (2002) state that “OF does not allow generalized embedded topicalization, although it does have Stylistic Fronting”, and they later add “...with the possible exception of very early texts”. They are probably right. In 13th c. OF, embedded clauses are generally SVO and non-subjects precede the finite verb in a restricted number of constructions, namely subject relatives and constructions with a pronominal subject. This is perfectly compatible with what we know of Stylistic Fronting. But we have seen in section 2 that in Early Old French, embedded V2 appears to be freely available in all types of embedded clauses. This is a first indication that the process that moves a constituent to Spec,IP at that stage of the language is distinct from Stylistic Fronting.

Also, the fronting of a constituent to Spec,IP does not obey the accessibility hierarchy observed in Icelandic : negation & sentence adverb > adjective > verb & particle. To account for Icelandic, Holmberg (2000) analyses the element in Spec,IP as an expletive. According to him, when the subject does not occupy its normal position in Spec,IP, the phonological features of the closest element available in the clause are moved to that position to satisfy the requirement of I to have phonological material in its Spec. This is expressed as a [P] feature on I. The accessibility hierarchy would correspond to the linear order of constituents in the clause. If EOF embedded V2 were due to Stylistic Fronting, we would expect the same type of restriction on the element which can appear in Spec,IP, but the facts don't support this analysis. For example, in (37), the accessibility hierarchy would lead us to expect the negative adverb *pas* to front (which is a possibility, simply not the choice taken here), blocking the raising of the PP *a Gormund*, and in (38) one would expect the infinitive to raise instead of the PP complement of that infinitive.

- (37) Huelin dist une novele [qui a Gorm[un]d ne fut pas bele] (Gormont, 239-240)

Huelin said a piece-of-news [which to Gormund neg was not good]

‘Huelin brought news which didn’t please Gormund’

- (38) [Se de ce vous volez **desfendre**], alez en tost voz armes prendre (Thebes1, p. 96)

if of this yourself-want to defend, go-loc soon your weapons take

‘if you want to defend yourself, go get your weapons now’

The general view is that Stylistic Fronting in Icelandic is triggered by the need to overtly fill Spec,IP with phonological material. This is a type of V2 requirement: in embedded clauses, the verb must be in second position, and, if the subject doesn’t occupy the preverbal position, some other element must fill the position. One way to reconcile many of the above examples with some variant of the Stylistic Fronting construction observed in Icelandic is to claim that the fronting of a non-subject observed in many of the previous examples is made possible by the fact that there is a null subject. Contrary to what is observed in 13th c. Old French, and as can be readily observed in (38) above, null subjects are regularly found in all types of embedded clauses in EOF, and not only in conjunctive clauses having a main clause V2 structure (Hirschbühler 1989, 1990). We might want to say that Spec,IP is the subject position where there is an overt subject, but, when no overt subject is projected, some other constituent comes to fill Spec,IP. This would be in keeping with the [P] feature of I postulated for Icelandic by Holmberg. The idea that SpecIP is filled by a non-subject only when subjects are null doesn’t work, however, because the fronting of a constituent to SpecIP is possible over an overt postverbal subject. Examples are plentiful. Postverbal subjects are found with transitive and intransitive eventive verbs, and there is no definiteness effect. Notice that the postverbal subject is not particularly heavy, and that it

can be found at the end of the clause, or between the auxiliary and the participle (39a), a position not attested in Vance's data for 13th c. Old French prose.

- (39) a. [Se dunc *se sunt* **païens** aperceuz,] / Ben tost m' averunt cest bon paleis toluz
If thus refl-aux pagans noticed / Very soon me-will have these good palaces taken .
 'If, thus, the pagans have noticed (this), they will soon have taken these good palaces from me.' (ChGuill, 2440-42)
- b. cel odor [Que en paraïs *gettent* **li flur**,] (Brandan, 96)
that odour that in paradise throw the flowers
- c. [Quant ço *veit* **Guenes** [que ore *s' en rit* **Rollant**]] (Roland, 303)
when it see Guenes that cunj refl-gen-laugh Roland
 'when Guenes sees that Roland doesn't care.'

More damaging for the idea of a [P] feature on I triggering embedded V2 is the fact that, in EOF, embedded clauses may be V1 (Hirschbühler, 1990; Roberts, 1993 :98; Vance, 1988). This is illustrated in (40) and (41). The examples in (41) show moreover that V1 embedded clauses are even found with a postverbal subject.⁶ These examples are not compatible with a Stylistic-Fronting-as-expletive-movement account of V2 embedded clauses.

- (40) a. [U que *trove* tes chevalers], sis prent, (ChGuill,966)

⁶ Examples (41a-b) are typical of Stylistic Inversion, which occurs in wh-constructions with an intransitive verb, and where the subject occupies a position which, superficially, looks like that of the direct object. This is not the case for (41c-d), where the subject precedes the participle, nor (41e-f), where the subject is followed by a direct object.

where that (he) finds your knights, si them-take

‘wherever (he) finds your knights, (he) takes them’

- b. [Puis qu’ *out* ço dist], plus n’ i targe; (Brandan, 619)

after that (he) had this said, no more neg there-stay

‘having said this, (he) didn’t stay any longer’

- c. Puis vunt ferir des espees [qu’ *unt* ceintes]. (Roland 3598, p. 252)

then go battle of-the swords [that (they) have girded]

‘then they go to battle with the swords that they have girded’

- d. E ne sevent [qu’ *est* devenuz] / Ne [en quel leu *est* detenuz]. (Brandan 1495-6)

and neg know-3p [what (he) is become] nor [in which place (he) is held]

‘and they don’t know what has become of him nor in which place he is held captive’

- (41) a. la bosce sur le nes [Que *avait* **Willame**], (ChGuill 2310-11)

the lump on the nose that had William

- b. [Quant l’ *unt* entendu **li païen e li Hungre**] (ChGuill, 3200)

when him-aux hear the pagans and the H.

‘when the pagans and the Hungarians had heard him’

- c. et [ainz que *fust* **le cors** couverz], franchi li rois cinc cent cuiverz. (Thebes 1, p. 192)

and [as soon as was the body covered], released the king five hundred slaves

- d. apoingnant vint par mi le pré / [ou *estoient* **li Grieu** jousté]; (Thebes2 p. 12)

spurring came in the field / [where were the Greeks assembled]

‘he came spurring in the field where the Greeks were assembled’

- e. Bien diviset e si li dit / [De quel *avrat* **chascuns** delit]. (Brandan, 1773-4)

well talks and so him-tells [of which will-have each-one pleasure]

‘he talks a lot and tells him which pleasures everyone will have’

- f. [Quant *ot li pedre* la clamour de son fil,] /Plourent sui ueil (Alexis XLV, 1-2)

when heard the father the noise of his son, cry his eyes

‘when the father heard the noise of his son, his eyes cried’

From the preceding discussion, we conclude that EOF allowed generalized V2 in embedded clauses. But EOF is atypical from the point of view of the symmetrical V2 languages discussed in the literature, e.g. Yiddish (Santorini, 1995), in that there was no requirement that the embedded clause be V2. V1 is freely allowed, and this is true even when there is a constituent that could fill Spec,IP. It appears, then, that the initial constituent in Spec,IP is not the typical V2 phrase of main clauses, required by a discourse-related head within the CP system. We will assume that the preverbal constituent is a scrambled element, an element moved to an accessible A-bar position, probably for discursive reasons. In the next section we turn to the analysis of the data.

6 The clausal architecture of embedded clauses

Because we find V2 clauses following *wh* interrogatives, as illustrated in (13) (section 3) which occupy a low focus position within a layered CP of type (32) (repeated below), we assume that the preverbal constituent in V2 embedded clauses is in Spec,IP, and not within CP.

- (32) [Hanging Topic [Scene Setting [DeclForce [Left dislocation [List interpretation [[FOCUS, CP] [Wh-opCP]]]]

FRAME	THEME	FOCUS
-------	-------	-------

The only exception to that generalization is the case of embedded main clauses, where a complementizer is followed by a V2 clause with an inverted pronominal subject. (32) allows us to derive these clauses without CP recursion by assuming that the complementizer under

Declarative Force is followed by the discourse-related head typical of main clauses which, as we have seen, is low in the structure, possibly within the Focus layer; the pronominal subject is, as usual, in Spec,IP.

Assuming that all other V1 and V2 embedded clauses are IP's, the most straightforward analysis is that the finite verb appears under I^0 with the past participle, if there is one, under its own projection (which we assume is aspectual (Asp^0) in (42b), but nothing that we are saying here hinges on that hypothesis).

(42) a. [Quant **en la chambre** *furent* tuit soul remes] (Alexis, XIII,61)

when in the room were all alone left

‘When they were alone in the room’

b. [wh-opCP Quand [FinP [IP en la chambre [I' furent [AspP tuit soul [Asp' remes [vP]]]]]]]

The EPP of I is satisfied by rich verbal morphology (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou, 1998; Vance, 1997; and others). This, according to Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou, is typical of null subject languages. As a result of V-to-I, the pronominal verbal morphology satisfies the EPP, viewed as a D feature on I. We may assume that the [D] feature attracts pronominal subjects, which are pure feature bundles. Nominal subjects, which have lexical content, may remain lower within the structure (in Spec,vP or in Spec,Asp). The I head doesn't bear a [P] feature forcing its specifier to be filled by phonetic material. The specifier position of I, then, is an A' position accessible to scrambled constituents.

These hypotheses account straightforwardly for V1 and V2 embedded clauses. But there is one other type of embedded clause word order that we need to account for: V3 embedded clauses.

Recall that Vance found embedded V3 clauses only when the first of the two preverbal constituents was a pronominal subject. The situation is different in EOF. Apart from the type Pronominal Subject-XP-V (43), one also finds the order Nominal subject-XP-V (44), XP-YP-V (45), XP-Nominal Subject-V (46). We provide enough examples to show the productivity of the construction. As much as possible we have provided examples where the verb is not final (i.e. where one cannot appeal to an SOV base) and where one of the preverbal constituent is distinct from a sentence adverb. To these examples, we may add the order XP-Pronominal Subject-V exemplified in (20).

- (43) a. [Se **vous a lui** voulez parler], vous n' i avez que demorer. (Thebes 1, p. 40)
if you to him want to talk, you neg loc have that stay
 'if you want to talk to him, you just have to stay'
- b. Nostre abes fist une grant diäblie / [Quant **il cest home** rechut en abëie]; (MoniageG1, 9, v. 190-191)
our abbot made a great mischief when he this man received in the abbey
- c. E Oliver, [qu' **il tant** poeit amer], (Roland, 2215)
...and Oliver, that he so-much could love
- d. et se **tu bien** la veus mentir,/ nel voudront pas cil consentir : (Thèbes1, p. 42)
and if you well it-want to-lie, neg-it will-want not these-ones consent
 'and if you want to swear off (your loyalty), they will not consent to it'
- (44) a. quar tant forfis [Que **jugemenz de mei** est pris.] (Brandan, 1247-8)
because so disobeyed that judgement of me is taken
 'because my sin is so great that I am already damned'

- b. [Quant **cil a Rome** *sont* ainsi reperié], /Li quens Guillelmes lez un buisson s' asiet ;
(CoLouis2 p. 191)
when these in Rome are so returned / the count William next-to a bush refl-sit
‘when they are thus returned to Rome, the count William sits next to a bush’
- c. Ne placet Damnedeu / [Que **mi parent pur mei** *seient* blasmet] (Roland p. 96, v. 1062-3)
neg please God / that my relatives for me be blamed
- d. Vint al roceit que [**li vilain / Or** *apelent* le Salt Brandan]. (Brandan, 163-4)
came to the rock that [the people now call the Salt Brandan]
- (45) a. [Quant **de Franceis les escheles** *vit* rumpre], (Roland 3533)
when of French the ranks saw break
‘when he saw the French ranks break’
- b. [Se **de vos le col** *en aveit* passé], Mar crendreies achaisun de malfé. (ChGuill. p. 83, v. 2029-2039)
If of you the neck gen-had passed, not-at-all would-fear grounds of demon
‘if it goes through your throat, you will not have to fear anything from the demon’
- c. Idunc plurerent .C. milie chevalers / [Qui **pur Rollant de Tierri** *unt* pitiet]. Roland 268, v. 3867-8)
Then cried hundred thousand knights [who for Roland of Thierry have pity]
‘Then a hundred thousand knights cried, who pity Thierry in place of Roland’
- d. un montre, /[qui **les houmes por deviner** / *souloit* ocirre et afoler]. (Thèbes1, p. 48)
a monster who the men to divine used-to kill and frighten
‘a monster who used to kill and frighten the men with riddles to solve’

- (46) a. mult lur desplout, [Que **en la citét hume** *n' i out.*] (Brandan 277-8)
much them-displease that in the city man not loc have
 'it displeased them that no one was in the city'
- b. car il set bien [qu' **encontre soi / son frere** *a pris la fille au roi*], (Thèbes1, p. 35)
because he knows well that in front of him, his brother has taken the daughter of the king
- c. Quar [quant **ço Deus** li volt mustrer], / Sur ço n' estout cirge alumer. (Brandan, 325-6)
For, when/since this God him-wanted to show, over this neg was necessary candle light
 'For, since God wanted to show this to him, it was not necessary to light a candle'
- d. n' avendroit pas [que **por seul toi / tant barons** *mentissent lor foi*], (Thèbes1, p. 42)
(that it) neg-come not that for only you / so-many barons lie their faith
 'it doesn't come about that so many barons swear off their faith for you only'

If we are right in claiming that pronominal subjects occupy Spec,IP, (43) shows that EOF allowed scrambling of at least one constituent between Spec,IP and the verb. The exact account of the construction is far from clear. We will discuss here various possibilities and will conclude that to account for V3 constructions, we have to enrich the structure in (42b).

Keeping the functional projections to a minimum, we might propose a split IP structure, with two inflectional projections available for the finite verb, as in (47). In V3 clauses, the verb would stay in the lower inflectional head. (47) is similar in some respects to Roberts (1993:138) and Cardinaletti and Roberts (2002)'s Agr1 and Agr2, but for them SpecAgr2, the lower Agr, was the subject position, while the specifier of the higher Agr1 was the site of optional topicalisation.

Here it is assumed that the subject position is the specifier of the highest head because this is where pronominal subjects are found when they are expressed. Let us assume that the highest head is TP and that the lower one is a scrambling projection on the head of which the verb may move, and stay. One may suppose that F is freely added to the numeration with an EPP feature satisfied by the scrambled constituent (Fanselow, 2001).

(47) [TP vous T [FP à lui [F' voulez [vP ...parler]]]] (=43a)

This account, which carries over to (44), postulates an FP projection for the scrambled constituent. We can understand how scrambling projections would be generated in the transition from a hypothesized V-final grammar of Latin to a V-medial grammar. Confronted with many V-final constructions, but wanting to keep the verb in medial position, learners develop a grammar where they freely generate scrambling positions between the subject and the verb to place the preverbal constituents. They then would end up producing V2+ constructions with a non-final verb. (The fact that we are studying rhymed verse undoubtedly plays a role in the frequent recourse to scrambling positions.).

The general structure in (47) is not devoid of problems, however. First, if object clitics are adjoined to the highest head having a T feature, as proposed in section 4, we would expect them, in (43)-(44), to surface with the subject to the left of the scrambled constituent, contrary to facts, as can be seen in (43d). Second, if extended to (45) and (46), where the first of the preverbal constituents is not a subject, we would end up with a construction where Spec,TP is filled by a non-subject without V-to-T movement, in contradiction to Bailyn (2004)'s Generalized Inversion framework. According to this framework "An uninterpretable [+T] feature must be checked by overt movement". The verb doesn't need to raise to T if there is a subject in Spec,TP, but if

Spec,TP is filled by a non subject, then V must raise to T to check [μ T]. In the (45)-(46), the verb would be under F even when a non-subject occupies Spec,TP.

This problem can be resolved in part by assuming that in (45)-(46) the second constituent is in Spec,TP while the first one is either adjoined to IP or in a topic position within the CP layer. Let us first consider the second alternative, which supposes that the first constituent corresponds to known information, and that the clause-introducer is high within the CP layer.

(48) [DeclForce Que [TopP en la citét [TP **hume** [T' n' i out.]]]] (=46a)

The first point, that the first of the two constituents is known information, doesn't seem to be contradicted by the examples in (45)-(46). Regarding the second point, we found no V3 construction with indirect questions, but these constructions are rare in general; in the examples that we found, the crucial ones are those with complementizer *qui*, like (45c-d). If *qui* is assumed to be under Fin because it bears subject/Agr information, then the constituents that follow it must be within IP and cannot be within the CP layer. Frey (2000) found that 'aboutness'-topics occur within IP in German; the same might be the case here (see also Belletti 2004).

The first alternative, that the first of the two constituents is adjoined to IP, is a clear possibility in the case where a sentence adverbial is the first constituent, as below. In main clauses, adverbs like *unc*, *ja* may occupy the first position of a V2 clause, triggering subject-verb inversion, but they may also adjoin to a V2 clause.

(49) a. Tient l' olifan, [qu' **unkes perdre** ne volt], (Roland p. 172 v. 2286)

holds the Oliphant that never lose neg want

'he holds the Oliphant that he would never want to lose'

- b, Ne place Damnedeu ne ses angles / [Que **ja pur mei** perdet sa valor France] ! (Roland p. 96 v. 1089-90)

not please God nor his angels / that ever because of me lose her valor France

Here, however, we face the problem of explaining why pronominal subjects, if, as we have argued, they are not clitics on C, precede such adverbs both in embedded clauses (50a) and in inverted main clauses (50b) while the same adverbs tend to occur at the left edge of the clause with nominal subjects and other preverbal constituents (51), although this order is not strict (52).

- (50) a. Amis, di moi / [se **tu onques** veïs tel beste]. (Thèbes1, p. 11)

Friend, tell me / if you ever saw such beast

- b. Guiburc ma femme **n' avras tu ja** a garder. " (ChGuill, p. 62, v. 1457)

Guiburc my wife neg-will-have you ever to keep

‘you will never have to keep Guiburc my wife’

- (51) Ne voil [que **ja un sul** s' en vant] ; (Gormont p. 4, v. 35)

neg want that ever one only refl-gen brag

‘I don’t want that one of them, ever, brag about it’

- (52) Li abes dunc les amonestet, / [Que **curages unc** ne cesset]: (Brandan 223-4)

the abbey thus them-warned, that courage ever neg-cease

‘the abbey, thus, warns them not to lose courage’

We have no ready-made answer to that question. The fact that the adverbs don’t adjoin to IP when IP is introduced by a pronoun could be linked to the fact that pronominal subjects are light elements, and, as such, they tend to prefer being at the left periphery of the clause (on the special behavior of light elements, see Abeillé & Godard 2000). Prosodic reasons could also be at play.

On the other hand, we know, from examples like (20), that adjunction to IP to the left of a subject pronoun is possible, although rare.⁷

We will adopt here a less economical account of embedded clauses, but one that solves many of the problems mentioned above. It consists in assuming a structure like that in (53), inspired by Haerberli (1999). Trying to account for the possibility or impossibility in some Germanic languages to find an adjunct between the complementizer and the subject, Haerberli argues that non adjacency between the complementizer and the subject is possible in languages in which the subject can remain in Spec,TP, Spec,AgrP being filled by a non-overt expletive similar to German *es*. The adjunct is claimed to occupy the specifier of an independent functional position (FP) between AgrSP and TP.

(53) [CP C [AgrP S_p [FP *XP* [TP S_n V... (*pas*) [AspP ... [vP ...]]]]]]

In this perspective, we need to revise our working idea that Spec,IP is an A-bar position. We also need to dissociate the [D] and [T] features that we implicitly assumed were associated with I. The highest position within IP is now Spec,AgrP, Agr being understood here as a projection whose [D] features are checked by a subject (a head similar to the Agr head hosting weak pronouns in Germanic languages; Zwart 1993, chap.3, and others); its specifier hosts pronominal and null subjects. The finite verb remains (with pronominal object clitics) under T whose [T]

⁷ One reviewer suggests that there may be two series of subject pronouns not distinguished orthographically: a clitic series and a separate tonic series. (50) would exemplify the clitic series. In (20), the pronoun would be tonic. This is not incompatible with the analysis in (53).

feature it checks and it doesn't raise overtly to Agr. Scrambled phrases are in Spec,FP, and adverbs like *onc*, *ja* are either adjoined to TP or in Spec,FP. Nominal subjects may remain in Spec,vP, Spec,AspP or Spec,TP, unless they precede some scrambled XP, in which case they occupy Spec,AgrP. Thus in V2 embedded clauses, the verb is under T and the preceding constituent in Spec,FP, with a null element in Spec,AgrP. For the exceptional cases where the pronominal subject is preceded by a constituent, we assume, in the case of (20a) that the embedded clause is adjoined to AgrP with the subject clitic in Spec,AgrP. For (20b), we may adopt the same analysis, or it could be that the pronominal subject is exceptionally in SpecTP, preceded by an XP in Spec,FP. Notice that if something like (53) is on the right track, we need to revise the generally accepted approach to V2 as a construction where the verb and the clause-initial constituent occupy the same projection. Both in main and in embedded clauses, V2 constructions would result from the verb being under one head and the clause-initial XP being under the specifier of some other head.

The main drawback of the analysis, if we follow Haeberli's ideas, is that, in embedded clauses with a postverbal subject, as well as in (45)-(46), we need to assume that the [D] features of Agr are checked by a null *es* expletive which has properties distinct from those of the expletive pronoun *il*, and for which no independent evidence exists. We also need to assume, to account for the generalized SVO character of 13th c. prose, that this particular null expletive disappeared during the 12th c., forcing subjects to raise to Agr in embedded clauses (unless Agr could be checked by an element in C⁰—a cliticized subject pronoun, the *qui* complementizer). A minimalist alternative which doesn't postulate an *es* null expletive for EOF has the [D] features of V raise to Agr in cases where Agr is not checked by a subject.

If (53) is adopted, the changes leading to 13th c. prose would follow if the AgrP and TP projections fused and were reinterpreted as IP, i.e. as a head bearing both [D] and [T] features, so that the verb now raises to the highest inflectional head instead of remaining lower in the structure. We may hypothesize that a newly introduced [P] feature on the inflectional head, as in Holmberg's analysis of Stylistic Fronting, is the trigger for the changes leading to 13th prose. The stricter SVO character of embedded clauses follows from the fact that the [D] features of V are not able to satisfy the [P] requirements of I, thus a subject must come to occupy Spec,IP. The disappearance of null subjects in embedded clauses also follows from the fact that they don't satisfy the [P] requirements of I. With the fusion of Agr and T, there is no longer room for an FP projection hosting scrambled constituents, and scrambled XPs are reinterpreted as filling Spec,IP when it is not filled by a subject. The reanalysis of pronouns as clitics on C would, in that perspective, be an independent change. While we are not totally satisfied with this analysis, we adopt it, as we find that it accounts for the main facts mentioned in this paper, and we will leave the matter for further research.

7 Summary and Conclusions

In this paper we have spelled out what we think is the clausal architecture of early 12th c. Old French. We have adopted a layered CP approach to main clauses and a layered IP approach to embedded clauses. In both cases, V2 turned out to require two distinct projections, the verb occupying one head and the preverbal XP the specifier of a distinct head.

This study identified a number of crucial differences between Early Old French verse and 13th c. Old French prose. Let us summarize the main ones. Both states of the language are V2 in main clauses, but they differ in embedded clauses:

- EOF does not have Stylistic Fronting, later Old French appears to have it.
- EOF has V2 embedded clauses, later Old French is more strictly SVO, except for Stylistic Fronting and embedded main clauses.
- EOF has V1 embedded clauses, this does not appear to be possible in later Old French.
- EOF has V3 embedded clauses, this is found only with a pronominal subject in later Old French.
- EOF freely allows null subjects in embedded clauses; this is no longer the case in later Old French.
- In EOF, nominal subjects may appear postverbally in all types of embedded clauses; this possibility is limited to specific constructions in later OF (embedded V2 clauses, Stylistic Inversion, Heavy NP shift).

In our opinion, these differences cannot simply result from the difference between verse and prose. They attest to important changes having occurred between the two stages of the language. All of these changes reflect the fact that embedded clauses came to be strictly SVO in later Old French, with overt subjects being the norm and XVO sentences limited to Stylistic Fronting constructions. Also, later Old French does not admit a scrambling projection between the subject and the verb. The change from generalized XVO to SVO in embedded clauses that we document here is one of a number of changes that will eventually lead to the language being SVO in main and in embedded clauses.

8 References

- Abeillé, A., Godard, D. 2000. French word Order and lexical Weight. In: Borsley, R. (Ed.), *The nature and function of Syntactic Categories*. Syntax and Semantics vol. 32. Academic Press, New York, pp. 325-358.
- Adams, M. 1987. From Old French to the theory of prodrop. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5, 1-32.
- Alexiadou, A., Anagnostopoulou, E. 1998. Parametrizing AGR: Word order, V-movement, and EPP-checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, 491-539.
- Arteaga, D., Herschensohn, J. (to appear) *Il était une fois: Diachronic development of expletives, Case, and agreement from Latin to Modern French*. In: Arteaga, D., Gess, R. (Eds.), *Historical Romance Linguistics: Retrospective and Perspectives*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Bailyn, J. F. 2004. Generalized Inversion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22, 1-49.
- Belletti, A. 2004. Aspects of the low IP area. In: Rizzi, L. (Ed.), *The structure of CP and IP*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 16-51.
- Benincà, P. 1991. Complement clitics in Medieval Romance: The Tobler-Mussafia law. In : Van Riemsdijk, H., Rizzi, L. (Eds.), *Clitics and their Hosts*. ESF-Eurotype report, Theme group 8: Clitics. Department of language and literature, Tilburg University, pp. 1-27.
- Benincà, P. 1995. Complement clitics and the Tobler-Mussafia law. In : Battye, A., Roberts, I. (Eds.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 325-344.

- Benincà, P., Poletto, C. 2002. Topic, Focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers. In: Rizzi, L. (Ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol.2, Oxford University Press, Oxford/New York, pp. 52-75.
- den Besten, H. 1989. *Studies in West Germanic Syntax*. Rodopi, Amsterdam.
- Cardinaletti, A., Roberts, I. 2002. Clause Structure and X-Second. In: Cinque, G. (Ed.), *Functional Structure in DP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 1. Oxford University Press, Oxford/New York, pp. 123-166. (Reprint of Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991.)
- Côté, M.-H. 1995. Concurrence grammaticale, conditions d'appréhensibilité et changement syntaxique: la chute de V2 en français et en anglais. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Département de linguistique et de traduction, Université de Montréal.
- Diesing, M. 1990. Verb movement and the subject position in Yiddish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8(1), 41-81.
- Dupuis, F. 1988. Pro-drop dans les subordonnées en ancien français. *Revue québécoise de linguistique théorique et appliquée* 7(3), 41-62.
- Fanselow, G. 2001. Features, Theta-roles and Free Constituent Order. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(3), 405-437.
- Fischer, S., Alexiadou, A. 2001. On Stylistic Fronting: Germanic vs. Romance. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 68, 117-145.
- Fontana, J. 1996. Phonology and Syntax in the Interpretation of the Tobler-Mussafia Law. In: Halpern, A., Zwicky, A. (Eds.), *Approaching Second. Second Position clitics and Related Phenomena*. CSLI Publications, Stanford, pp. 41-83.

- Frey, W. 2000. Über die syntaktische Position der Satztopiks im Deutschen. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 20 (Berlin), 137-172.
- Fuss, E. 2003. On the historical core of V2 in Germanic. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26.2, 195-231.
- Haeberli, E. 1999. On the Word Order 'XP-Subject' in the Germanic Languages. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 3, 1-36.
- Halpern, A. L. 1992. Topics in the placement and morphology of clitics. Doctoral dissertation. Stanford University.
- Hirschbühler, P. 1989. On the existence of null subjects in embedded clauses in Old and Middle French. In : Kirschner, C., De Cesaris, J. (Eds.), *Studies in Romance Linguistics*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 155-175.
- Hirschbühler, P. 1990. La légitimation de la construction V1 à sujet nul dans la prose et le vers en ancien français. *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 19, 32-55.
- Holmberg, A. 2000. Scandinavian stylistic fronting : How any category can become an expletive. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31(3), 445-483.
- Jónsson, J. G. 1991. Stylistic fronting in Icelandic. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 48, 1-43.
- Kaiser, G. 2000. Dialect contact as a prerequisite of parametric change: A case study on French word order change. *Arbeiten zur Mehrsprachigkeit - Folge B, Nr. 3 (Sonderforschungsbereich 538, Universität Hamburg)*.

- de Kok, A. 1985. La place du pronom personnel régime conjoint en français : une étude diachronique. Rodopi, Amsterdam.
- Labelle, M., Hirschbühler, P. 2001. Les clitiques arguments en serbo-croate et dans l'histoire du français. In : Muller, C. et al. (Eds.), *Clitiques et Cliticisation*, Actes du Colloque de Bordeaux. Éditions Slatkine, Genève, pp. 109-132.
- Labelle, M., Hirschbühler, P. 2005. Changes in clausal organization and the position of clitics in Old French. In: Battlori, M. et al. (Eds.), *Grammaticalization and Parametric Variation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 60-71.
- Lemieux, M., Dupuis, F. 1995. The locus of verb movement in non-asymmetric verb second languages : The case of Middle French. In : Battye, A., Roberts, I. (Eds.), *Clause structure and language change*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 80-109.
- Maling, J. 1980/1990. Inversion in embedded clauses in Modern Icelandic. In: Maling, J., Zaenen, A. (Eds.), *Modern Icelandic Syntax*, *Syntax and Semantics* 24. Academic Press, San Diego, pp. 3-40.
- Martins, A. M. 2000 [1995]. A Minimalist Approach to Clitic Climbing. In : Costa, J. (Ed.), *Portuguese Syntax: New Comparative Studies*. Oxford University Press, Oxford/New York, pp. 169-190. [Reprinted with minor revisions from : Martins, A. M. 1995. A Minimalist Approach to Clitic Climbing. In : Dainora, A. et al. (Eds.), *Papers from the 31st Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Volume 2: The parasession on clitics. The Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, pp. 215-233.]
- Mathieu, É. 2005. Stylistic Fronting in Old French. Ms. University of Ottawa.

- Mussafia, A. 1886. Una particolarità sintattica della lingua italiana dei primi secoli. In : Ascoli, G.I. et al. (Eds.), *Miscellanea di filologia e linguistica in memoria di Napoleone Caix e Ugo Angellello Canello*. LeMonnier, Firenze, 255-261.
- Pesetsky, D., Torrego, E. 2004. Tense, Case, and the nature of syntactic categories. In: Guéron, J., Lecarme, J. (Eds.), *The Syntax of Time*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 495-537.
- Poletto, C. 2003. Sì and e as CP expletives in Old Italian. In: Battlori, M. et al. (Eds.), *Grammaticalization and Parametric Variation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 206-235.
- Rivero, M. L. 1997. On Two Locations for Complement Clitic Pronouns: Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian and Old Spanish. In : van Kemenade, A., Vincent, N. (Eds.), *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 170-206.
- Roberts, I. 1993. *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Rizzi, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In: Haegeman, L. (Ed.), *Elements of grammar*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 281-337.
- Rögnvaldsson, E., Thráinsson, H. 1990. On Icelandic word order once more. In: Maling, J., Zaenen, A. (Eds.), *Modern Icelandic Syntax*. Academic Press, San Diego, pp. 3-40.
- Santorini, B. 1995. Two types of verb second in the history of Yiddish. In: Battye, A., Roberts, I. (Eds.), *Clause structure and language change*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 53-79.
- Schwartz, B., Vikner, S. 1996. The verb always leaves IP in V2 clauses. In : Belletti, A., Rizzi, L. (Eds.), *Parameters and functional heads*, Oxford University Press, Oxford/New York, pp. 11-62.

- Sigurðsson, H. Á. 1990. V1 declaratives and verb raising in Icelandic. In : Maling, J., Zaenen, A. (Eds.), *Modern Icelandic Syntax*. Academic Press, San Diego, pp. 41-69.
- Sitaridou, I. 2004. The licensing of null subjects in Old French. Talk, University of Ottawa, Sept.13, 2004.
- Tobler, A. 1875 (=1912). Besprechung von J. Le Coultre, *De l'ordre des mots dans Chrétien de Troyes*. *Vermische Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik* 5, Leipzig, pp. 395-414.
- Vance, B. 1988. L'évolution de Pro-drop en français médiéval. *Revue québécoise de linguistique théorique et appliquée* 7(3), 85-109.
- Vance, B. 1997. *Syntactic change in medieval French : Verb second and null subjects*. Kluwer, Dordrecht .
- Vikner, S. 1995. *Verb movement and expletive subjects in the germanic languages*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Zwart, C. J.-W. 1993. *Dutch Syntax: A minimalist approach*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Groningen.

List of Old French Texts

- Anonymous [1040], *La vie de Saint Alexis* (*La vie de Saint Alexis, poème du XIe siècle. éd. par Gaston Paris, Paris, Champion, 1967.*) [Alexis]
- Anonymous [c. 1100], *Chanson de Roland* (*La Chanson de Roland, éd. par Gérard Moignet, 2e édition, Paris, Bordas, 1971.*) [Roland].

Benedeit [1106-1121], Voyage de Saint-Brandan (The Anglo-norman Voyage of St Brendan, éd. par Ian Short et Brian Merrilees) [Brandan].

Anonymous [1125], Gormont et Isembart (Gormont et Isembart, éd. par A. Bayot, Paris, Champion, 1931.) [Gormont].

Anonymous [c. 1130], Couronnement de Louis (Le couronnement de Louis, éd. par Ernest Langlois, Paris, Champion 1925) [CoLouis1].

Anonymous [XIIe siècle], Couronnement de Louis (Rédaction AB) (Les Rédactions en vers du Couronnement de Louis, éd. par Yvan G. Lepage, Paris) [CoLouis2].

Anonymous [1150], Chanson de Guillaume (La Chanson de Guillaume, éd. par Duncan McMillan, Paris, Picard, 1949-1950.) [ChGuill].

Anonymous [1150], Moniage Guillaume. Première rédaction (Les deux rédactions en vers du Moniage Guillaume, éd. par Wilhelm Cloetta, Paris, SATF, tome 1, 1906.) [MoniageG1].

Anonymous [1150], Roman de Thèbes (Le Roman de Thèbes, publié par G. Raynaud de Lage, tome I, Paris, Champion, 1966.) [Thebes1].

Anonymous [1150], Roman de Thèbes (Le Roman de Thèbes, publié par G. Raynaud de Lage, tome II, Paris, Champion, 1966.) [Thebes2].

Anonymous [c. 1170] Li quatre livre des reis (Li quatre livre des reis, ed. par Ernst Robert Curtius, Dresden, Niemeyer, 1911.)[QLR]

Abstract :

The structure of early 12th century Old French main and embedded clauses is documented. It is argued that V2 main clauses are derived within a layered CP structure, where the verb moves to Fin and the clause-initial topic to the specifier of a discourse related head, which is shown to be low within CP. All types of embedded clauses have V2 constructions where a constituent distinct from the subject precedes the verb. These constructions are not the result of Stylistic Fronting, but of generalised V2. The existence of V3 embedded clauses is also discussed. It is proposed that embedded IP's have the pronominal subject or clause initial constituent under the specifier of the highest inflectional head (bearing a [D] feature), a scrambled constituent within an FP projection, and the verb under T. The differences between early 12th c. Old French verse and 13th c. Old French prose are discussed.

Keywords:

Old French, syntax, V2, Stylistic Fronting, clitics, left periphery